



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/682,507 | 10/10/2003 | Michiharu Arimoto | L8612.03103 | 9880 |
| 79297 | 7590 | 03/31/2009 | EXAMINER | |
| Dickinson Wright PLLC | | | CLOUD, JOIYA M | |
| James E. Ledbetter, Esq. | | | | |
| International Square | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 1875 Eye Street, N.W., Suite 1200 | | | 2444 | |
| Washington, DC 20006 | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 03/31/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|
| Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/682,507 | ARIMOTO ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Joiya M. Cloud | 2444 |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 26 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-27.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444

A) "However, the Office Action fails to cite any references in support of the argument that it was well known at the time of the invention for network monitoring systems to display all four of these types of data...it is improper to take Official Notice of this technical fact without citing to any references..."

As to the above point A), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner submits that Applicant has failed to point out any flaws in Examiner's Official Notice including stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. As to adequately traverse such a finding, an Applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the Examiner's Action, Applicant's traversal is therefore improper. Examiner notes that Applicant instead merely alleges that "it is improper to take Official Notice of this technical fact without citing to any references..." MPEP 2144.03 states that "If applicant adequately traverses the Examiner's assertion of official notice, the Examiner must provide documentary evidence in the next Office action if the rejection is to be maintained," however Applicant has failed to do so. Furthermore, "If applicant does not traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or applicant's traverse is not adequate, the examiner should clearly indicate in the next Office action that the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant either failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or that the traverse was inadequate." MPEP 2144.03

B) Ludwig does not teach or suggest the claimed feature of "in response to a request by a user, the display-information generation section regenerates, for continuous play back, information of a sequence of individual actions that occurred on the network and cooperates with the display unit...within the sequence as the action occurred."

As to the above point B), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner submits that Ludwig clearly discloses continuous play back in col. 28, lines 48-65 where a time-stamped sequence of requests and events are played back. Applicant seems to suggest that the annotated snapshots are the sole functionality disclosed, however Ludwig only states that the "In the present invention it can be used, for example, to reproduce annotated snapshots as they occurred at recording." Furthermore, whether the play back of snapshots of a 2-hour movie or the playback of the full 2-hour movie itself, such recitation can be synonymous with "continuous playback". Applicant has not provided any limiting features which define what the continuous play back is, therefore any playback that is uninterrupted fulfills this functionality. Examiner also submits that nowhere does the claim recite "continuous play back" that actually occurs, rather the language ("for continuous play back") has questionable patentable weight. This does not reflect the regenerating directly, but states what the regeneration "is for", the intended use, of the regeneration of the generation section. Applicant should amend the claim to clearly require that the generation section performs the functionality.